

The Action admits that Rich fails to disclose a LNA with an adjustable input intercept point. Nor does Rich disclose that the input intercept point is adjusted depending on the computed error rate. The Action relies on Younis for the claimed features missing from Rich.

Younis teaches adjusting the input intercept point of the active devices (e.g., LNA 1220b and mixer 1230) within a receiver 1200 in accordance with an amount of non-linearity in a received signal.

The Action asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Rich by adding a LNA with an adjustable input intercept point as shown in Younis. The Action does not indicate why it would have been obvious to modify Rich in the manner suggested. The statement "in order to minimize degradation in the performance of a receiver" at best explains a possible result of a combination but does not explain why one skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the proposed combination.

Even if one would have thought to combine Rich and Younis, one would still have had to modify the combined teachings to obtain the features recited in Applicant's claim. Rich discloses adjusting the gain of a receiver. In Younis, the intercept point of the mixer and LNAs is adjusted based on the measured non-linearity of the received signal. Nowhere in either Rich or Younis is it suggested that it would be possible or desirable to adjust the input intercept point based on the computed error rate of the receiver.

In contrast to Rich and Younis, Applicant's claim 1 recites adjusting the input intercept point, not the gain, of the LNA based on the computed error rate, not the measured non-linearity of the received signal. As described in Applicant's specification, e.g., at page 8, lines 5-22, the LNA gain and the LNA input intercept point are independently adjustable. Thus, even if one would have thought to combine Rich and Younis, one would still have had to modify the combination to provide some way to change the input intercept point independent of the gain and to make the adjustment based on the computed error rate rather than the measured non-linearity of the received signal.

Applicant submits that one skilled in the art would not have been motivated to modify Rich with the teaching of Younis, nor would such a combination result in the features recited in Applicant's claim. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Rich and Younis. Claims 8 and 15 recite features analogous to those recited in claim 1, and are allowable for at least the same reasons. Claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-24 depend from claims 1, 8, or 15, and are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Applicant believes the application to be in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests notice thereof at an early date. If any issues remain, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

By: Michael J. Crowley
Michael J. Crowley
Registration No. 49,009

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(919) 941-9240

Date: January 2, 2002

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Washington DC 20231 on January 2, 2002 <u>Judith Harris</u> Judith Harris January 2, 2002 Date
--